

Serial No.: 09/681,591  
Amdt. Dated: September 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 19, 2004

RD29133-2

### REMARKS

In the office action mailed July 19, 2004 the Examiner allowed claims 22-26, and 63, rejected claims 1-2, 12-15, 17, 19, 27, 29, 37-40, 42, 45, 47, 55-57 and 60 and objected to claims 3-11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 28, 30-36, 47, 43, 44, 46, 48-54, 58, 59, 61 and 62. Claims 1-64 are pending in the application

The July 19, 2004 Office action has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 27, 29, 45, 46, and 58 have been amended. Claims 3 and 28 have been canceled. Claim 64 has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### Corrections

The Applicant notes for the record that amendments to claims 2 and 29 have been made to correct errors of obvious oversight and are not related to any reason of patentability. The inadvertent recitation of the term "providing" in claim 2, which has no antecedent basis, has been removed and the claim amended to incorporate the term "positioning" with has antecedent basis. Original claim 29 had inadvertently recited "A rear projection television according to claim 24...", which has no antecedent basis. Claim 29 has been amended to recite "A rear projection television according to Claim [24] 27...".

#### 35 USC § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 12-15, 17, 19, 45, 47, 55-57, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldenberg (US 5,760,955).

The Examiner has kindly pointed out under ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 3, specifically the limitation "shaped such that a

Serial No.: 09/681,591  
Amdt. Dated: September 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 19, 2004

RD29133-2

distribution of optical paths of light exiting the screen is at least two times a coherence length of the light”.

The Applicant thus requests that claim 3 be canceled without prejudice.

The Applicant respectfully submits that, in order to anticipate under §102, a reference must teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Goldenberg et al does not teach all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that amended claim 1 overcomes the rejection and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 12-15, 17 and 19 are dependent on claim 1. The Applicant respectfully submits that since claim 1 should now be allowable in light of the current amendments, the rejection of claims 2, 12-15, 17 and 19 are now moot. The Applicant thus respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 12-15, 17 and 19.

The Examiner has kindly pointed out under ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER that claim 46 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 45 has been amended to recite the limitation of original claim 46, specifically the limitation “shaped such that a distribution of optical paths of light exiting the screen is at least two times a coherence length of the light”.

Applicant respectfully submits that, in order to anticipate under §102, a reference must teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Goldenberg et al does not teach all of the limitations of amended claim 45. Applicant therefore submits that amended claim 45 overcomes the rejection and is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that claim 46 and 58 be amended to remove specifically the limitation “shaped such that a distribution of optical paths of light exiting the screen is at least two times a coherence length of the light” incorporated into claim 45.

Serial No.: 09/681,591  
Amdt. Dated: September 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 19, 2004

RD29133-2

Claims 47, 55-57 and 60 are dependent on claim 45. The Applicant respectfully submits that since claim 45 should now be allowable in light of the current amendment to claim 45, the rejection of claims 47, 55-57 and 60 are now moot. The Applicant thus respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 47, 55-57 and 60.

### 35 USC § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected 27, 29, 37-40, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg (US 5,760,955) in view of Yoshida (US 5,066,099).

The Examiner has kindly pointed out under ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER that claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 27 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 28, specifically "...optical path distributing screen element shaped such that a distribution of optical paths of light exiting the screen is at least two times a coherence length of the light".

Applicant respectfully requests that claim 28 be canceled without prejudice.

In order to be unpatentable under §103, a reference must teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Goldenberg et al in view of Yoshida et al does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of amended claim 27. Applicant therefore submits that amended claim 27 overcomes the rejection and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 29, 37-40, and 42 are dependent on claim 27. The Applicant respectfully submits that since claim 27 should now be allowable in light of the current amendments, the rejection of claims 29, 37-40, and 42 are now moot. The Applicant thus respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 29, 37-40, and 42.

### Claim Objections

Serial No.: 09/681,591  
Amdt. Dated: September 16, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 19, 2004

RD29133-2

Claims 3-11, 16, 18, 20-21, 28, 30-36, 41, 43-44, 46, 48-54, 58-59, and 61-62 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant submits that currently amended claims 1, 27, and 45 and all dependent claims are currently in condition for allowance. Therefore the objection that claims 3-11, 16, 18, 20-21, 28, 30-36, 41, 43-44, 46, 48-54, 58-59, and 61-62 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim is now moot. The Applicant thus respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 3-11, 16, 18, 20-21, 28, 30-36, 41, 43-44, 46, 48-54, 58-59, and 61-62.


New claim

Claim 64 has been added to this application. Support for this new claim is found in page 4, line 5-9 of the application.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits the application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew J. Caruso  
Reg. No. 48,520

General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A71  
Schenectady, New York 12301  
September 16, 2004  
Telephone: (518) 387-7354